

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT		1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE OF PAGES 1 3	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. A0002		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 05/16/2008		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	
5. PROJECT NO. <i>(If applicable)</i>		6. ISSUED BY U.S. DOT/RITA/Volpe Center 55 Broadway, RTV-6D1 Cambridge MA 02142-1001		7. ADMINISTERED BY <i>(If other than Item 6)</i> U.S. DOT/RITA/Volpe Center 55 Broadway, RTV-6D1 Cambridge MA 02142-1001	
CODE		FACILITY CODE		8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR <i>(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)</i>	
				9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. DTRT57-08-R-20022	
				9B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 11)</i> 04/25/2008	
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 13)</i>	

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers

☐ is extended.
☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: <i>(Specify authority)</i> THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES <i>(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)</i> SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER <i>(Specify type of modification and authority)</i>

E. IMPORTANT:

Contractor
☐ is not.
☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

See the attached continuation sheets for details.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER <i>(Type or print)</i>		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER <i>(Type or print)</i>	
		Elizabeth A. Segal	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ <i>(Signature of person authorized to sign)</i>		_____ <i>(Signature of Contracting Officer)</i>	

1. The purpose of this amendment is to revise parts of Section L of the RFP, provide a revised List of Attendees for the Pre-Proposal Conference, and to provide responses to the questions received in response to the RFP.
2. Section L.5.D, Parts of the Technical Proposal, Oral Presentation, Technical Understanding and Management Approach, Page 83, is hereby revised to read as follows:

TECHNICAL UNDERSTANDING AND MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Presentation

The oral presentation shall consist of two separate sections: (1) Technical Understanding and (2) Management Approach. The structured oral presentation shall not encompass proposed price, cost, or fee.

ORAL PRESENTATION SCHEDULE			
Evaluation Criteria	Topic	Time Limit	Presenters
Technical Understanding	Presentation of Technical Understanding *	60 minutes	Program Manager and/or any of the Work Area Experts
Technical Understanding	Structured Questions and Answers on Technical Understanding	20 minutes	Presenters from above
Break			
Management Approach	Presentation of Management Approach **	20 minutes	Program Manager and/or any of the Work Area Experts
Management Approach	Structured Questions and Answers on Management Approach	10 minutes	Presenters from above

*** Technical Understanding**

In order to allow a complete evaluation, the Offeror shall use the presentation to describe how it plans to meet the requirements of the contract and to demonstrate that it has the necessary understanding, expertise, and experience to successfully accomplish the range of tasks and all eight (8) work areas as described in the SOW. The Offeror will have up to 60 uninterrupted minutes to make its presentation upon the CO's direction to begin. The CO will strictly enforce the 60-minute time limit. The presentation shall begin with the Program Manager's introduction of himself/herself and the Work Area Experts by name, position, and company affiliation.

**** Management Approach**

In order to allow complete evaluation of the Offeror's capability to effectively and efficiently manage the work represented by this contract, the Offeror shall describe its (1) approach to managing task order contracts, (2) approach to forming teams as task orders arise, ensuring task requirements are successfully accomplished, activities are kept on schedule, and tasks are completed within budget, including its approach to managing changes that impact cost and schedule and (3) organizational structure, roles and responsibilities of individuals, prime contractor and subcontractors, and lines of communication. Additionally, the Offeror shall describe its approach to managing changes that impact cost and schedule. The Offeror shall specifically address its capabilities for successfully completing the requirements of the SOW while performing multiple tasks at U.S. locations east of the Mississippi River and west of the Mississippi River simultaneously, including, but not limited to, office locations, equipment, analytical and project management applications, and access to analytical and research facilities relevant to the requirements of SOW. The Offeror will have up to 20 uninterrupted minutes to make its presentation upon the CO's direction to begin. The CO will strictly enforce the 20-minute time limit.

Following the Technical Understanding and Management Approach presentations, there will be a structured question-and-answer session related to the Government's requirements and program objectives."

[Please note that the Management Approach section has not changed.]

3. Section L.5.D, Parts of the Technical Proposal, Part A - Staffing (Volume III), is hereby revised as follows:

The following sentence at the bottom of Page 86 is hereby deleted in its entirety:

"The Offeror shall include a matrix of the staff members for whom resumes are being submitted cross-referenced by the eight (8) technical work areas in which they would be expected to be deployed."

4. The following attachments are provided with this modification:

1. Pre-Proposal Conference Attendees (Revised May 12, 2008)
2. Submitted Questions with the Corresponding Answers

5. Please acknowledge receipt of this amendment with the submission of your proposal.
6. All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain unchanged.

PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE ATTENDEES (REVISED MAY 12, 2008)
MAY 8, 2008
SOLICITATION NO. DTRT57-08-R-20022
OPERATIONS RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS (ORA) SERVICES

NAME	COMPANY
Alexander, Amy	Aptima, Inc.
Allen, John	Battelle
Beard, Robert	Computer Sciences Corporation
Belek, David	Technical and Project Engineering, LLC
Bonello, Mario	Chenega Advanced Solutions & Engineering, LLC
Brodesky, Robert	URS Corporation
Budin, David	Crown Consulting, Inc.
Butchko, Michele	Interactive Elements Inc. and QWIC Inc.
Carpenter, John	Triunity Engineering and Management
Carter, Mark	Science Applications International Corporation
Clancy, William	QWIC Inc.
Clark, Stephen	Computer Sciences Corporation
Clarke, David	IBM Global Business Services
Cotroneo, Anthony	Deep Water Point LLC
Cramer, Linda	Chenega Advanced Solutions & Engineering, LLC
DeMara, Rob	Operation Phoenix
DiCarlo, Jennifer	Cambridge Systematics Inc.
Drohan, Donna	Drohan Consulting
Falk, Alan	Booz Allen Hamilton
Faria, David	Technology Solution Providers
Farrington, Stephen	Applied Research Associates
Fitzroy, Steve	Fitzroy & Associates
Fraser, Stephanie	Flatirons Solutions Corp.
Frauenfelder, Al	ESRI
Frolow, Dr. Igor	IBM Global Business Services
Gertler, Judith	Foster-Miller, Inc.
Gilbert, Eli	Interactive Elements Inc.
Gilpatrick, George	Cahill Swift, LLC
Goode-Jones, Sherlonda	PricewaterhouseCoopers
Han, Charlie	MacroSys Research and Technology
Herman, Darcy	MacroSys Research and Technology
Hicks, Robert	Science Applications International Corporation
Hussey, Laurie	Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Jaffe, William	Technical and Project Engineering, LLC
Karp, Jordan	URS Corporation
Khera, Vinnie	Harris Miller Miller & Hanson
Lamoureux, Mark	DaCar Inc.
Lemn, Sarah	Operation Phoenix
Macy, Griffin	QWIC Inc.
McGuinness, Frank	Battelle
Morrison, John	Cahill Swift, LLC
Rosamilia, Peter	Science Applications International Corporation
Santalucia, Antonio ("Pepper")	ICF International
Sharpe, Linda	Booz Allen Hamilton
Skretta, Magadlene	Econometrica, Inc.
Thomas, Marvin	Triunity Engineering & Management
Troup, Kenneth	North River Consulting Group
Warade, Ritesh K.	IBI Group
Wolfe, Michael	North River Consulting Group
Youman, Mark	ICF International

**SUBMITTED QUESTIONS WITH THE CORRESPONDING ANSWERS
SOLICITATION NO. DTRT57-08-R-20022**

Q1. Please provide a provisional / preliminary organizational structure for the proposed Volpe Centers of Excellence.

A1. The Volpe Center will not be able to provide this information at this time. The proposed Centers of Innovation have not been approved at this time. When approved, the organizational structure will be on the Volpe Center website.

Q2. Please provide a copy of the RITA Strategic Plan or please indicate if there have been any updates since the 2006 Strategic Plan.

A2. There have not been any updates to the RITA Strategic Plan since 2006. The RITA Strategic Plan may be found at the following link:
http://www.rita.dot.gov/publications/transportation_rd_t_strategic_plan/

Q3. Please confirm that the management approach is only required in the Oral presentations, and is not required in the Technical Proposal (Volume III.A).

A3. Yes. Your statement is correct.

Q4A. Are all proposed subcontractors required to have a Government-approved accounting system?

A4A. No.

Q4B. If so, this will significantly limit the available pool of small businesses. Also, if a proposed subcontractor does not have a Government-approved accounting system, are subcontract types other than cost-reimbursement/cost-plus-fixed-fee permitted?

A4B. Yes, but preferably under \$400,000.

Q5. For Part B, Past Performance, (RFP, p. 88), the Government requests five (5) contracts that the Offeror considers the most relevant in demonstrating its ability to perform the proposed effort. Can an Offeror list an IDIQ umbrella-type contract as a single entry and a relevant task under the umbrella with a value over \$1,000,000 as an additional entry?

A5. No.

Q6. For Part B, Past Performance, (RFP, p. 88) the Government requires a list of prime contracts with the federal Government of the offeror and major subcontractors for currently performing or completed contracts within the last three (3) years.

May we assume when the list contains an IDIQ type contract, that individual task orders are not required?

A6. No. Please list all relevant task orders.

Q7. In the event that an Offeror submits a proposal as both a Prime on the Full and Open solicitation, DTRT57-08-R-20022, and a subcontractor on the 8(a) solicitation, DTRT57-08-R-20023, would the Offeror be precluded from either opportunity based upon the conflict of interest clauses contained in the solicitations?

A7. No, not at the Master Contract level. However, there may be a conflict at the task order level, which would have to be determined at the time of task order issuance.

Q8. RFP Page 21 notes that most of the work is anticipated to be done at the Contractor's facility, but some task orders may require performance at the Government facility. Please clarify under what circumstances on-site work might be required under this contract, rather than through the contracts awarded under Solicitation No. DTRT57-08-R-20023.

A8. This will be determined at the time of task order issuance based on the nature of the work to be performed.

Q9. Please clarify the goals for the small business subcontracting plans. Specifically, it is not clear whether the goals stated in the solicitation are the overall goals for all contractors awarded contracts under the solicitation, or whether the subcontracting plan must assume that these goals will apply to each Offeror.

A9. These goals apply to each Offeror.

Q10. Could clarification be provided of the potential Cost Plus Award Fee evaluation factors. In some cases, they appear to be highly subjective in nature, i.e., "substantial innovative thought," and therefore potentially difficult to quantify.

A10. Clarification will not be provided at this time. These evaluation factors would only be applicable when a Cost-Plus-Award-Fee task order is issued.

Q11. Will payroll back up and recent audit information be required to be submitted as part of the cost and business proposal?

A11. Payroll back up – No. Recent audit information – Yes.

Q12. RFP Section H.18 requires Contractors to disclose "all past, present or planned contractual interests with an organization regulated by DOT..." Please clarify how "contractual interests" is to be interpreted. For example, does the Contractor need to disclose all contracts with organizations that are affected by the DOT?

A12. Yes. However, this will be applicable at the task order level.

Q13. To be considered responsive to the eight specific work areas, will each contractor be required as part of its team to have the expertise to address each of the potential tasks listed in the solicitation, or rather the broader aspects identified for each work area?

A13. The broader aspects identified for each work area. See Page 83 of the RFP.

Q14. Regarding RFP Section L.3.C., can portions of the CD version of the Cost and Business Proposal be submitted in PDF, readable with Adobe Acrobat?

A14. Yes. However, the cost schedules should be in Microsoft Excel.

Q15. Is a Checklist (referred to on RFP Page 61, Instructions for Cost and Business Proposal) required to be submitted by each subcontractor, or just the Prime Offeror?

A15. Yes, both the Prime Offeror and each subcontractor.

Q16. Regarding the performance reports for the 5 most relevant contracts (RFP Page 88, Part B-Past Performance) – are Offerors required to provide 5 for the Prime Offeror only, 5 for the Prime Offeror and 5 for any major subcontractor, or 5 total for the Prime and any major subcontractors?

A16. 5 total for the Prime and any major subcontractors (over 20 percent of the hours in the Cost and Business Proposal).

Q17. At the May 8 Pre-Bid Conference, contractors were strongly advised to review their current Volpe contracts with respect to the provisions of Section L.2.D. In [Company name deleted] current subcontract with CASE, neither the body of the CASE subcontract, or the flow down provisions from their prime contract contained Section L.2.D, or any clause relating to limitation of future contracting or conflict of interest notification. If there is such a clause in the CASE prime contract it was not incorporated in the subcontract. Can Volpe advise how we should proceed?

A17. See response to Q7. above.

Q18. Section L.5.D of the RFP (Oral Presentation) allows up to 40 minutes for the Technical Understanding presentation, in which time, contractors are expected to demonstrate their understanding, expertise and experience for each of eight (8) SOW areas, plus introductions of key personnel. Given the number of SOW areas to be covered, we are requesting that the time allotted for the technical presentation be increased to 60 minutes to allow for adequate coverage of all SOW areas.

A18. Yes, the Oral Presentation time for the Technical Understanding presentation has been increased to 60 minutes. See revised Section L, Paragraph L.5.D. above.

Q19. Section L.5.D of the RFP (Oral Presentation) allows for the Management Approach portion of the Oral Presentation to be delivered by the Program Manager and/or any of the Work Area Experts. Following the Presentation of the Management Approach is a structured Q&A Session and the RFP states that "Presenters from above" may participate. Will the government allow Work Area Experts who participated during the Technical Understanding presentation, but not during the Management Approach presentation, to participate during the Management Approach Questions and Answers?

A19. No.

Q20. Section L.5.D of the RFP (Oral Presentation) states that the offeror may bring no more than eight persons to the Oral Presentation, including no more than two non-presenting officials or employees. For clarification purposes, does the government intend to limit the number of presenters to six people? Will the government allow for up to nine presenters so that the Program Manager and each Work Area Expert can participate during the oral presentation?

A20. No, only up to eight presenters.

Q21. Section L.5.D of the RFP (for Staffing—Proposed Technical Staff) requires a matrix of the staff members for whom resumes are being submitted cross-referenced by the eight (8) technical work areas. Should this matrix include 12 staff members (of the proposed technical staff) or up to 21 staff members (the proposed technical staff, program manager, and Work Area Experts)?

A21. The matrix should include as many staff members as the Prime and teaming partners have. Please see the first paragraph on Page 86 of the RFP.

Q22. Section L.5.D of the RFP (Past Performance) requests that offerors provide a list of contracts that it is currently performing or has completed within the past three years. For clarification, can this list include contracts whose ordering period ended four years ago, but whose performance continued and is within the 3-year timeframe?

A22. Yes.

Q23. Section L.5.D of the RFP (Past Performance) requires offerors to ensure that past performance evaluations are submitted for the five most relevant contracts. Can one or more of the five contracts be from a subcontractor?

A23. Yes. See response to Q16. above.

Q24A. The Volpe Center allowed its previous general purpose Operations Research contract (OMNI ORA) to lapse in 2004. Please explain why the Volpe Center is now creating this new contract. Are there indications of major new OR work?

A24A. Yes

Q24B. Or is the purpose of this contract to consolidate the existing work done under other contracts?

A24B. No.

Q25A. This is projected as a multiple-award contract. Please explain how the Volpe Center will allocate work between the multiple awarded contractors. Will each task be competed among all the approved ORA full & open contractors (as was done on the OMNI contracts)?

Q25A. Yes

Q25B. Or does the Volpe Center intend to award selected task orders to contractors without further task order-level competition?

A25B. Yes, but only if the task order meets the criteria of FAR 16.505(b)(2), *Exceptions to the fair opportunity process*, and Paragraph G.4 Task Orders Issued Under Multiple Award Contracts of the Master Contract.

Q26. If the Volpe Center intends to award selected task orders to contractors without further task order-level competition, then what will be the criteria for this award?

A26. See response to Q25B. above.

Q27A. In addition to this full & open contact, the Volpe Center has another ORA proposal in process for 8(a) contractors. The scopes of these two opportunities have significant overlap. Will each ORA task be competed among both the full & open and 8(a) contractors?

A27A. No.

Q27B. Or does the Volpe Center intend to allocate selected task orders to the full & open contractors, and allocate others to the 8(a) contractors?

A27B. Yes.

Q28. If the Volpe Center intends to allocate selected task orders to the full & open contractors, and allocate others to the 8(a) contractors, then what will be the criteria for this allocation?

A28. The Contracting Officer will determine the proper contract vehicle to use based on the work requirements of the task order.

Q29A. How would the Volpe Center handle opportunities that an awarded contractor might identify and bring to the Volpe Center?

A29A. There is a work acceptance process for all new work that might come to the Volpe Center.

Q29B. Will such task orders be competed among the contractors, or will this task be awarded directly to the contractor who identified and brought it to the Volpe Center?

A29B. All task orders will be competed among the contractors.

Q30. During the Pre-Proposal conference, the Volpe Center presented a number of existing projects that it is performing with operations research requirements. For these current tasks, is the Volpe Center performing this work all by itself, or does it utilize contractors in support of these tasks?

A30. The Volpe Center is performing this work with a combination of both Volpe Center federal employees and contractors.

Q31. If contractors are supporting the existing operations research projects, then does the Volpe Center intend to transfer these OR-oriented tasks to the new OR contracts?

A31. No.

Q32. Will any existing models/simulations/tools be made available for use by the selected contractors?

A32. A determination will be made at the task order level.

Q33. Does the Volpe Center intend to issue an Administrative Task Order, to fund planning efforts prior to the award of specific task orders?

A33. No.

Q34. Schedule 5 references proposed amounts for fixed fee, award fee, and profit. Does the reference to "fixed fee" relate to CPFF task orders, and "profit" to firm fixed price task orders?

A34. Yes. Both statements are correct.